

## PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

### ARTICLE DETAILS

<b>TITLE (PROVISIONAL)</b>	Acceptance of COVID-19 vaccines in Palestine: A cross-sectional online study
<b>AUTHORS</b>	Zawahrah, Hassan; Saca-Hazboun, Hanan; Melhem, Shatha; Adwan, Rabee; Sabateen, Ali; Abu-Rmeileh, Niveen

### VERSION 1 – REVIEW

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Alshareef, Noor King Abdulaziz University
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	09-Jun-2021

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	<p>Below are my comments for improvement and the paper can be accepted following revisions that carefully consider the comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1- Please discuss in-depth the rationale of the study</li><li>2- The discussion and introduction are not relevant to the data collection period. Data were collected in October 2020 (Data was collected before the novel vaccine came out) Thus, discussion and introduction should be focused on that period.</li><li>3- How was the online questionnaire distributed?</li><li>4- A more detailed description of the questionnaire is needed. How many items in total? Were they close or open questions? other? please add as much information as possible.</li><li>5- Did the authors validate the new version of the questionnaire? no info is provided.</li><li>6- Significant findings should be articulated at the beginning of the discussion section</li><li>7- Why the acceptance rate of a vaccine among Palestinians was a bit high? Is there any comparable evidence regarding the acceptance rate for other viral pathogens among Palestinians?</li><li>8- Discussion is very thin. more in-depth and critical discussion is needed.</li></ol>
-------------------------	--

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Sahin, Mustafa Ondokuz Mayis University
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	10-Jul-2021

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	<p>Dear Author,</p> <p>It is a well-written manuscript. And it is an important and hot topic during pandemics.</p> <p>General and specific comments to the authors It would be best if you gave with 95%CI and with correct writing like OR = 4.48, not 1.00 I corrected some typos. I attached an MS Word File.</p>
-------------------------	--

	<p>You can find more information on the barriers to COVID-19 vaccination for the introduction section  <a href="https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33998108/">"https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33998108/"</a>  Give information about how to calculate your sample size in the method section.  I added the frequency information to the statistical analysis section.  It would be best if you gave the exact p-value. (like <math>p &lt; 0.05</math>)  <math>p = 0.012</math>  NOT CL, you should use 95%CI. Would you please review them all?  You could find and add articles to lower COVID-19 vaccination willingness values in the discussion section.  It would be best if you wrote "Centers for Disease Control and Prevention" before the abbreviation.  You can find more information about COVID-19 vaccination among healthcare workers for the discussion section  <a href="https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33864328/">"https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33864328/"</a>  You can find more information about childhood vaccination. And parental attitudes about COVID-19 vaccination for the discussion section  <a href="https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33998108/">https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33998108/</a>  I would like to review it after revision.  Best wishes</p>
--	--

## VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 1

Dear reviewer, thank you for your comments about our manuscript.

The comment (1):

Please discuss in-depth the rationale of the study

The response (1):

Thank you for your comment.

We have discussed fully the importance of this study in the discussion part and highlighted many recommendations based on the results of the study. Such as: lines # 218-219, 221-223, 251-253, 312-313.

Furthermore, vaccine uptake is very low in many countries, given that the demonstrations happening in France recently about the right to select or not the vaccine, and how that could be against human rights\*.

Study published recently and cited below; saying that having free strategy and ability to select the vaccine could affect positively the willingness to get the vaccine and therefore end the pandemic.

And so this is our rationale, to ask the people whether they want to get the vaccine or not ; and this is the importance of our study which shows that people are willing to get the vaccine and their right to ask the government to provide the vaccine.

We stated in the discussion that "Some of Palestine's neighboring countries such as Jordan and Egypt have started their vaccination campaigns, and Palestinians also have the right to have fair and equal access to necessary health care, including COVID-19 vaccines, to face the burden of the pandemic"

\*Ref. Sprengholz P, Eitze S, Korn L, Siegers R, Betsch C. The power of choice: Experimental evidence that freedom to choose a vaccine against COVID-19 improves willingness to be vaccinated. Eur J Intern Med. 2021;87:106-108. doi:10.1016/j.ejim.2021.03.015

The comment (2):

The discussion and introduction are not relevant to the data collection period. Data were collected in October 2020 (Data was collected before the novel vaccine came out) Thus, discussion and

introduction should be focused on that period.

The response (2):

We tried to track the situation ahead of time, and exploring the people's opinions whether they will be willing to receive the vaccine if becomes available. In addition to that, our study has been conducted even before different vaccine being produced, and before the debate on the type of vaccine would be chosen. This gave our study the importance. Therefore, people can decide either to receive the vaccine or not regardless of the producer. Thus, facing the pandemic effectively and reduce the burden on the health sectors.

The comment (3):

How was the online questionnaire distributed?

The response (3):

Thank you for your comment. Text was edited accordingly. Lines 117-118

The comment (4):

A more detailed description of the questionnaire is needed. How many items in total? Were they close or open questions? other? please add as much information as possible.

The response (4):

Thanks for your comments. Eventually, this was described in details in the methodology section under the data collection sub-heading. Also the questionnaire will be attached as supplementary file for more information.

The comment (5):

Did the authors validate the new version of the questionnaire? no info is provided.

The response (5):

Thank you for your note. The questionnaire was pilot tested and we used face-validity with three experts to ensure the integrity of the survey.

The comment (6):

Significant findings should be articulated at the beginning of the discussion section

The response (6):

Thanks for your comment. We have discussed that at the beginning of the discussion section lines 218-219; starting with the finding of the main question which is about the willing to accept the vaccine.

The comment (7):

Why the acceptance rate of a vaccine among Palestinians was a bit high? Is there any comparable evidence regarding the acceptance rate for other viral pathogens among Palestinians?

The response (7):

This was expected. Since the routine vaccination rate among Palestinians have shown to be high and almost complete for children, polio also was eradicated in 2012, and that shows how Palestinians have appreciation to the importance of vaccination and had high compliance towards vaccination.

The comment (8):

Discussion is very thin. more in-depth and critical discussion is needed.

The response (8):

Thank you very much for your comment. We tried the best to enrich our discussion and text was modified accordingly. It would be more useful comment if you highlight which point need more discussion. But we are happy with discussion as it is, and hopefully you will be satisfied with it.

Reviewer: 2

Dear reviewer, thank you very much for your detailed comments, edits, and valuable suggestions.

The comment (1):

It would be best if you gave with 95%CI and with correct writing like OR = 4.48, not 1.00

The response (1):

Thank you for your suggestion, text was edited accordingly.

There is a 95% CI for the married group compared to the reference group which is the "not married".

However, there is no 95%CI for the females and the age group 18-24 as they are reference category; you can notice that in Table.4. 1. So I edited the text suitably according to that.

The comment (2):

You can find more information on the barriers to COVID-19 vaccination for the introduction section "<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33998108/>"

The response (2):

Thank you for your suggestion, this reference was cited at the discussion section.

The comment (3):

Give information about how to calculate your sample size in the method section.

The response (3):

Thank you for your note. Text was edited according to your suggestion. Lines (118-120).

The comment (4):

I added the frequency information to the statistical analysis section.

The response (4):

Thank you for your addition.

The comment (5):

It would be best if you gave the exact p-value. (like  $p < 0.05$ )  $p = 0.012$

The response (5):

Thank you for your comment, text was edited according to your suggestion. Lines 173-174.

The comment (6):

NOT CL, you should use 95%CI. Would you please review them all?

The response (6):

Text was edited according to your note; thank you for your comment. You can notice that at lines # 204 to #215.

The comment (7):

You could find and add articles to lower COVID-19 vaccination willingness values in the discussion section.

The response (7):

Thank you for your suggestion. However, we could not use this reference for comparison.

The comment (8):

It would be best if you wrote "Centers for Disease Control and Prevention" before the abbreviation.

The response (8):

Thank you for your notice; text was modified according to that. Line (235)

The comment (9):

You can find more information about COVID-19 vaccination among healthcare workers for the discussion section "<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33864328/>"

The response (9):

Thank you for your suggestion. Text was edited accordingly. Line #281

The comment (10):

You can find more information about childhood vaccination. And parental attitudes about COVID-19 vaccination for the discussion section

<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33998108/>

The response (10):

Thank you for your suggestion. Text was edited accordingly. Line# 290-292.

## VERSION 2 – REVIEW

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Sahin, Mustafa Ondokuz Mayıs University
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	21-Aug-2021

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	Dear Author,  Thank you for your corrections. It is publishable manuscript for me. Best wishes
-------------------------	---